REMARKS

In the September 29, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-28 were pending in the application and rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 6,971,101 to Clayton et al. and 6,092,048 to Nakaoka (References A and C, respectively) were cited. Claims 1-28 remain in the case. The rejections are traversed below.

In rejecting claims 1, 11 and 20, it was acknowledged that Clayton et al. "does not disclose ... user configurable metering" (September 29, 2006 Office Action, page 3, lines 4-5) as recited at claim 1, lines 3-4. However, it was asserted that Nakaoka in the Abstract, Fig. 25 and column 8, lines 37-65 disclosed user configurable metering. Most of the words on the last ten lines of the Abstract in Nakaoka appear on page 3, lines 6-12 of the Office Action, while "defined in the applicant's remarks on page 7, the ... 'user configurable metering' would be the ability of a user to configure how the focus manager determines the number of request[s] of a given priority should be executed" appears on page 3, lines 13-15 of the Office Action. Finally, it was asserted that incorporating what is disclosed by Nakaoka into the system taught by Clayton et al. would have been obvious "for a faster execution, and efficiency for processing numerous amounts of requests that may be made by a user" (Office Action, page 3, lines 18-19).

It is submitted that Nakaoka fails to overcome the acknowledged lack of teaching or suggestion in Clayton et al. that a user can configure how the "focus manager 206" determines the number of requests of a given priority should be executed. The Examiner apparently believes that the statement in the Abstract of Nakaoka that the "task execution support system supports the user such that the user can execute a task while determining the contents ... and ... procedure ... in accordance with ... progress of ... [the] task without defining a ... procedure from the start to end of a task" (Abstract, lines 7-12) would suggest modification of Clayton et al. to meet the limitations recited in the independent claims. However, the Abstract of Nakaoka appears to be talking about a system that simplifies defining the procedure performed by a task. This does not seem to have anything to do with determining the number of requests of a given priority that should be executed by the focus manager 206 in Clayton et al. or doing anything "in accordance with user configurable metering" (e.g., claim 1, last 2 lines). Thus, Applicants do not understand how the statements in the Abstract of Nakaoka are related to configuring the "focus manager 206" of Clayton et al. "user configurable metering" as recited in the claims.

Figure 25 of Nakaoka, which is described in the cited portion of column 8 and presumably was cited as illustrating the sentences in the Abstract of Nakaoka cited in the rejection, appears to show the ability of a user to select a task from task list 1520 and the ability to display a

task property in section 1530 and a task action in section 1540. Nothing has been found in Fig. 25 or its description in the cited portion of column 8 that suggests to the Applicants any modification of Clayton et al. to provide for user configuration of the focus manager 206. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 11 and 20, as well as claims 2-10, 12-19 and 21-28 which depend therefrom, patentably distinguish over Clayton et al. in view of Nakaoka for at least the reasons discussed in the Amendment filed July 11, 2006 (the date "26 July 2006" mentioned in the Office Action Summary is presumably the date the Amendment was delivered to the Examiner, or some other internal date at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office).

In rejecting claims 2, 12 and 21, Figs. 7 and 8 and portions of columns 5, 6, 8 and 10 of Nakaoka were cited. The addition of these portions of the disclosure in Nakaoka does not help Applicants understand why Nakaoka was cited. Figure 7 is described as "an event condition table" (column 6, line 61) and indicates that tasks are targets of events which have various types and may be associated with a title of a target object. The portion of the description of Fig. 7 cited at column 10, lines 45-59 states that the fields in the first column are identifiers, and the fields in the remaining three columns either represent or express "the time that the event condition wants to indicate" (e.g., column 10, lines 50-51). As noted above and in the July 10, 2006 Amendment, one aspect of the invention missing from Clayton et al. is providing a way for a user to configure how the focus manager determines the number of requests of a given priority should be executed. It is not understood how anything that expresses or represents "the time that the event condition wants to indicate" would be relevant to what is missing from Clayton et al. Furthermore, it is not understood how Fig. 7 and column 10, lines 45-59 of Nakaoka is relevant to sorting "the resource acquisition requests into at least two separate queues" as recited in these claims. The fact that the sorting in claims 2, 12 and 21 is performed based on "different request types" is hardly suggested by the listing of event types in the event condition table.

Figure 8 and column 5, lines 49-67 were apparently cited in rejecting claims 2, 12 and 21 to show how "the event types are defined. However, the list of event types in Fig. 8 do not seem to have anything to do with either "resource acquisition requests" as recited in claims 2, 12 and 21 or the focus manager 206 in Clayton et al. which the Examiner has acknowledged needs to be modified to suggest the broadest recitation of the invention in claims 1, 11 and 20. While column 5 does mention "the task is classified based on the task definition, according to the method of classifying the task based on the object information" (column 5, lines 57-60), no suggestion has been found that tasks can be equated with "resource acquisition requests" or

that the classification described in <u>Nakaoka</u> constitutes sorting based on "different request types" as recited in claims 2, 12 and 21.

The same lack of suggestion to modify the focus manager 206 in <u>Clayton et al.</u> or sort resource acquisition requests has been found in the description of creating "new task entries ... to write respective chapters" (Office Action, page 4, lines 15-16) which apparently is what was considered relevant in column 6, lines 17-20 of <u>Nakaoka</u> and reading "task information ... to change memorized task information in accordance with a task information reference/operation request issued from the task information display/operation unit 1030 or the event rule driver unit 1040" (Office Action, page 4, lines 17-20) which apparently is what was considered relevant in column 8, lines 4-12 of <u>Nakaoka</u>. For the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 2, 12 and 21 further patentably distinguish over <u>Clayton et al.</u> in view of <u>Nakaoka</u>.

The wording of the rejection of the remaining claims, 3-10, 13-19 and 22-28, was un-changed from the January 11, 2006 Office Action, except for the addition of the words "in view of Nakaoka" in regard to all of the rejections, except for the rejection of claims 5, 15 and 24. It is submitted that that the additional distinctions over the prior art due to the lack of equivalence between the present invention and <u>Clayton et al.</u> discussed in the July 11, 2006 Amendment also apply to the rejections based on <u>Clayton et al.</u> and <u>Nakaoka</u>.

Request for Examiner Interview

Given the Applicants' inability to understand why <u>Nakaoka</u> was believed by the Examiner to suggest modification of <u>Clayton et al.</u> and the additional details recited in claims 2, 12 and 21, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone to arrange an Interview prior to further examination of the claims, unless the next Office Action does not rely on <u>Nakaoka</u> in rejecting the claims.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-28 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/28/07

By: _Richard A. Gollhofer_
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501